

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

MARCIA COPELAND, M.D.,

1:18-cv-00019-NLH-KMW

Plaintiff,

MEMORANDUM

v.

OPINION & ORDER

US BANK, et al.

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

MARCIA COPELAND, M.D.
2 APPLE RIDGE WAY
EAST BRUNSWICK, NJ 08816

Plaintiff appearing pro se

ROBIN LONDON-ZEITZ
GARY C. ZEITZ, LLC
1101 LAUREL OAK ROAD, SUITE 170
VOORHEES, NJ 08043

On behalf of Defendants US Bank and Gary C. Zeitz, LLC

BRETT JOSEPH HAROLDSON
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NJ
25 MARKET ST, 7TH FL, WEST WING
PO BOX 116
TRENTON, NJ 08625

On behalf of Defendant Nan Famular

TIMOTHY J. GALANAUGH
CAMDEN CITY ATTORNEY OFFICE
CITY HALL
520 MARKET STREET
ROOM 420
CAMDEN, NJ 08101

On behalf of Defendant Camden City Tax Office

HILLMAN, District Judge

WHEREAS, on August 30, 2018, the Court dismissed the complaint of Plaintiff, Marcia Copeland, M.D., concerning the foreclosure of a property located at 451 Line Street in Camden, New Jersey¹ (Docket No. 23, 24); and

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2018, Plaintiff filed an appeal to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals (Docket No. 25); and

WHEREAS, on December 21, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion for an injunction (Docket No. 27), which the Court denied on the same day (Docket No. 28)²; and

WHEREAS, also on December 21, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion for recusal (Docket No. 29)³; and

¹ Plaintiff has asserted at least nine essentially identical or similar actions in this District. COPELAND v. ABO & COMPANY, LLC, 1:13-cv-03978-RMB-KMW ("Copeland I"); 1:13-cv-03979-RMB-KMW ("Copeland II"); 1:13-cv-04232-RMB-AMD ("Copeland III"); and COPELAND v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 3:15-cv-07431-AET-TJB ("Copeland IV") COPELAND v. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, 1:18-cv-10554-NLH-JS ("Copeland VI"); COPELAND V. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, 1:17-cv-12104-NLH-JS ("Copeland V"); COPELAND v. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, 1:18-cv-10554-NLH-JS ("Copeland VI"); and COPELAND v. TOWNSHIP OF PENNSAUKEN, 1:14-cv-02002-RMB-AMD; COPELAND v. NEWFIELD BANK, 1:17-cv-00017-NLH-KMW; COPELAND v. US BANK, 1:18-cv-00019-NLH-KMW.

² In that same Order, the Court denied the identical motion filed by Plaintiff in COPELAND V. STATE OF NEW JERSEY, 1:17-cv-12104-NLH-JS ("Copeland V").

³ The motion for recusal was docketed after the Court's Order denying Plaintiff's motion for an injunction was entered on the docket.

WHEREAS, the Court previously addressed and denied the identical motions for recusal in Copeland V and Copeland VI; and

WHEREAS, the Court adopts the analysis in Copeland V (Docket No. 107) and Copeland VI (Docket No. 10), and similarly declines to recuse from this case;

THEREFORE,

IT IS on this 4th day of June, 2019

ORDERED that Plaintiff's "MOTION for Judge Hillman to recuse himself from all filings made by the plaintiff" [29] be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

At Camden, New Jersey

s/ Noel L. Hillman
NOEL L. HILLMAN, U.S.D.J.